

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

JEREMY JOSEPH STROHMEYER,

Plaintiff,

v.

K. BELANGER et al.,

Defendants.


Case No. 3:14-cv-00661-RCJ-WGC
AMENDED ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion for reconsideration on this Court’s screening order. (See ECF Nos. 44, 49). A motion to reconsider must set forth “some valid reason why the court should reconsider its prior decision” and set “forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to persuade the court to reverse its prior decision.” *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F.Supp.2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2003). Reconsideration is appropriate if this Court “(1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. Acands, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). “A motion for reconsideration is not an avenue to re-litigate the same issues and arguments upon which the court already has ruled.” *Brown v. Kinross Gold, U.S.A.*, 378 F.Supp.2d 1280, 1288 (D. Nev. 2005).

The Court has reviewed the motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 49), screening order (ECF No. 44), and second amended complaint (ECF No. 33). The Court finds that the motion for reconsideration is without merit because the Court did not commit clear

1 error and Plaintiff's alleged "new evidence" does not change anything. As such, the Court
2 denies the motion for reconsideration.

3
4 DATED THIS August 7, 2018.

5
6 
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28